

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT) ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Master File No. 3:07-md-05944-SC

MDL No. 1917

This Document Relates To:

ALL INDIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

Electrograph Sys., Inc., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 11-cv-01656;

Electrograph Sys., Inc., et al. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05724:

Siegel v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 11-cv-05502;

Siegel v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05261:

Best Buy Co., Inc., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al. No. 11-cv-05513;

*Best Buy Co., Inc., et al. v. Technicolor SA,
et al.* No. 13-cv-05264:

Target Corp. v. Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd., et al., No. 11-cv-05514;

Target Corp. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05686:

Sears, Roebuck & Co., et al. v. Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd., et al. No. 11-cv-05514-

Sears, Roebuck & Co., et al. v. Technicolor SA, et al. No. 13-cv-05262:

Interbond Corp. of Am. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al. No. 11-cv-06275;

Interbond Corp. of Am. v. Technicolor SA, et al. No. 13-cv-05727;

Interbond Corp. of Am. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05727;

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
DIRECT ACTION PLAINTIFFS' AND
INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS'
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL
THEIR OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
BASED UPON PLAINTIFFS'
PURPORTED FAILURE TO
DISTINGUISH BETWEEN
ACTIONABLE AND NON-ACTIONABLE
DAMAGES UNDER THE FTAIA; AND
DIRECT ACTION PLAINTIFFS'
OPPOSITION TO THE LGE
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR PARTIAL
SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON FTAIA
GROUND

1 *Office Depot, Inc. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al.,*
2 No. 11-cv-06276;

3 *Office Depot, Inc. v. Technicolor SA, et al.,*
4 No. 13-cv-05726;

5 *CompuCom Systems, Inc. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et*
6 *al., No. 11-cv-06396;*

7 *Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et*
8 *al., No. 11-cv-06397;*

9 *Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Technicolor SA,*
10 *et al., No. 13-cv-05723;*

11 *P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corp., et*
12 *al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 12-cv-02648;*

13 *P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corp., et*
14 *al. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-*
15 *05725;*

16 *Schultze Agency Servs., LLC v. Hitachi,*
17 *Ltd., et al., No. 12-cv-02649;*

18 *Schultze Agency Servs., LLC v. Technicolor*
19 *SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05668;*

20 *Tech Data Corp., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et*
21 *al., No. 13-cv-00157;*

22 *Viewsonic Corp. v. Chunghwa Picture*
23 *Tubes, Ltd., et al., No. 14-cv-02510;*

24 *Dell Inc., et al. v. Hitachi Ltd. et al., No. 13-*
25 *cv-02171.*

1 On December 23, 2014, the Direct Action Plaintiffs (“DAPs”) and Indirect Purchaser
 2 Plaintiffs (“IPPs”) (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) filed an Administrative Motion to Seal Portions of
 3 their Opposition to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment Based Upon Plaintiffs’
 4 Purported Failure to Distinguish Between Actionable and Non-Actionable Damages Under the
 5 FTAIA; and Direct Action Plaintiffs’ Opposition to the LGE Defendants’ Motion for Partial
 6 Summary Judgment on FTAIA Grounds Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5(d) to file
 7 under seal portions of the following documents:

- 8 • Direct Action Plaintiffs’ and Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’
 9 Motion for Summary Judgment Based Upon Plaintiffs’ Purported Failure to
 10 Distinguish Between Actionable and Non-Actionable Damages Under the FTAIA;
 11 and Direct Action Plaintiffs’ Opposition to the LGE Defendants’ Motion for Partial
 12 Summary Judgment on FTAIA Grounds (“Opposition”)
- 13 • Exhibits 1-9 and Exhibits 11-30 to the Declaration of Philip J. Iovieno in Support of
 14 the Opposition (“Iovieno Declaration”)
- 15 • Julie French Declaration in Support of Direct Action Plaintiffs’ Opposition to
 16 Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment Based Upon Plaintiffs Purported Failure
 17 to Distinguish Between Actionable and Non-Actionable Damages Under the FTAIA
 18 (“French Declaration”)

19 Having read and considered the papers filed and arguments made by counsel, and good
 20 cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs’ Administrative Motion to Seal
 21 Portions of their Opposition to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment Based Upon
 22 Plaintiffs’ Purported Failure to Distinguish Between Actionable and Non-Actionable Damages
 23 Under the FTAIA; and Direct Action Plaintiffs’ Opposition to the LGE Defendants’ Motion for
 24 Partial Summary Judgment on FTAIA Grounds Pursuant to Local Civil Rules 7-11 and 79-5(d)
 25 is GRANTED.

1 **IT IS SO ORDERED**
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: _____

Hon. Samuel Conti
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE